Application No. 09/857,096
Attorney Docket No. 11721US02

REMARKS

The present application includes claims 20-40. Claims 20-40 were rejected. By this Amendment, claims 20, 27, and 34 have been amended.

Claims 20-21, 23-28, and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Pascal Chauffour, U.S. Patent No. 5,870,397 ("Pascal").

Claims 22 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pascal Chauffour, U.S. Patent No. 5,870,397, in view of Yushi Naito, U.S. Patent No. 5,121,349 ("Yushi").

Claims 34-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pascal Chauffour, U.S. Patent No. 5,870,397, in view of Yushi Naito, U.S. Patent No. 5,121,349, in further view of Nuri Ruhi Dagedeviren, U.S. Patent No. 6,356,593("Ruhi").

Additionally, the Examiner objected to the Abstract because the Abstract includes the words "NEW ABSTRACT" on the top of the page due to filing requirements for the PCT application. As per the Examiner's request, an amended Abstract on a clean sheet without the word "NEW" is enclosed.

Also, the Examiner objected to the specification because the title of the application appeared at the top of the first page of the specification. The Applicant is ready to work with the Examiner to make the changes required by the Examiner, but is uncertain as to what changes the Examiner desires. More specifically, the Applicant assumes that the Examiner does not desire that the Title of the application be canceled

from the application. The Applicant is aware that under PCT procedure a new substitute sheet with only the title may be introduced, but the Applicant does not believe that the same procedure applies here. The Applicant stands ready to work with the Examiner when the situation becomes more clear.

The Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 20-21, 23-28, and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pascal. Pascal teaches a method and system for silence removal in a voice signal transported through a communication network. Pascal only teaches a single type of communication signal, a voice signal, as recited in the title of Pascal and throughout the specification.

Pascal does not teach detecting one of a plurality of communication types because there is only a single communication type, a voice signal in Pascal. Additionally, the Applicant agrees with the Examiner's statement that Pascal does not teach a plurality of registers arranged to fluctuate pseudo-randomly, as stated at the bottom of page 6 of the present Office Action.

Independent claims 20 and 27 have been amended to more clearly recite 1) detecting one of a plurality of communication types and 2) a plurality of registers arranged to fluctuate pseudo-randomly. Consequently, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the elements of claims 20 and 27 are not taught by Pascal. Thus, independent claims 20 and 27 (and their respective dependent claims 21-26 and 28-33) are respectively submitted to be allowable.

The Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 22 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pascal in view of Yushi. Claims 22 and 29 depend from claims 20 and 27 respectively which are respectfully submitted to be allowable. Consequently, claims 22 and 29 are also respectfully submitted to be allowable.

The Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 34-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pascal in view of Yushi, in further view of Ruhi. As discussed above, Pascal does not teach detecting one of a plurality of communication types, as recited in claim 34. Consequently, Pascal can not teach a register control adjusting a first value in response to the detected communication type, especially wherein the first value is used by a plurality of registers arranged to fluctuate pseudo-randomly, as recited in claim 34.

Yushi teaches a digital noise generator. Yushi teaches the generation of a pseudo-random signal. However, Yushi does not teach a register control adjusting a first value in response to a detected communication type, wherein the first value is used by a plurality of registers arranged to fluctuate pseudo-randomly, as recited in claim 34.

Ruhi teaches a data optimized codec. In Ruhi, as stated by the Examiner at the middle of page 7 of the Office Action, there are two communication types, data and voice. However, as stated by the Examiner in the Office Action and in Ruhi at Col. 2, Lines 15-19, and Col. 3, Lines 28-33, the echo canceller is only active when voice traffic

is detected. When data traffic is detected, the echo canceller is deactivated. Consequently, when echo canceller is deactivated, there can be no register control adjusting a first value in response to a communication type and then using the first value in a plurality of registers arranged to fluctuate pseudo-randomly.

Consequently, none of Pascal, Yushi, nor Ruhi teaches a register control adjusting a value in response to a communication type and then using the first value in a plurality of registers arranged to fluctuate pseudo-randomly, as recited in claim 34. In Pascal there is only one type of communication. In Yushi there is no teaching of communication type. In Ruhi, the echo canceller just shuts down.

Consequently, the Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 34, and its respective dependent claims 35-40, are allowable.

Application No. 09/857,096
Attorney Docket No. 11721US02

CONCLUSION

If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicant can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the Applicant at the number below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any necessary fees or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 9, 2005

Joseph M. Barich
Registration No. 42,291

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661

Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100